

**REMARKS**

The Examiner objected to the specification as allegedly referring to element (60) as both a depression and a groove. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestion to overcome the objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Vial 3,990,440.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Borsanyi 4,671,792.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ewerlof 4,869,457.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Vial 3,990,440.

Applicants respectfully contend that Vial does not anticipate claim 1, because Vial does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Vial does not teach that metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. In contrast, Vial teaches its apparatus is for use with blood. Vial, col. 1, l. 1-15, col. 2, l. 30-34, col. 5, l. 8-19. That is, Vial does not teach a metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Vial does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-13 and 15-16 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 3-13 and 15-16 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully contend that Vial does not anticipate claim 17, because Vial does not teach each and every feature of claim 17. For example, Vial does not teach that the material delivery unit includes a valve. In contrast, Vial does not teach the use of a valve to input material into the system. Vial, col. 4, l. 4-15, Fig. 1. Hence, the reference does not teach that the material delivery unit includes a valve. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Vial does not anticipate claim 17, and that claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 18-22 depend from claim 17, Applicants contend that claims 18-22 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully contend that Vial does not anticipate claim 23, because Vial does not teach each and every feature of claim 23. For example, Vial does not teach that a metering element is one of translationally slidable and rotatable engagement with

the compressible line. In contrast, Vial teaches a rotational engagement of the tube through a multi-point compression of the tube by a plurality of rotating rollers. Vial, col. 2, l. 56-61; col. 4, l. 15-21; Fig. 3. Here, the reference does not teach translationally slidable and rotatable engagement; rather, the Applicant does. Application, p. 9, l. 18-20. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Vial does not anticipate claim 23, and that claim 23 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 24-26 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 24-26 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully contend that Vial does not anticipate claim 31, because Vial does not teach each and every feature of claim 31. For example, Vial does not teach that the reservoir may be inserted into the device. In contrast, Vial teaches that the flask (2) is fixed on support (1), and further, that a tube (10) connects the flask (2) to the pump(6). Vial, col. 4, l. 4-15, Fig. 1. That is, as the flask is not inserted into the device, the reference does not teach such. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Vial does not anticipate claim 31, and that claim 31 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 32-33 depend from claim 31, Applicants contend that claims 32-33 are likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Borsanyi 4,671,792.

Applicants respectfully contend that Borsanyi does not anticipate claim 1, because Borsanyi does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Borsanyi does not teach that metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. In contrast, Borsanyi teaches its apparatus is for use with wound fluid, urine,

pleura, or other drainage systems. Borsanyi, col. 1, l. 5-11, 64-68. That is, Borsanyi does not teach a metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Borsanyi does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 7-9 are likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ewerlof 4,869,457.

Applicants respectfully contend that Ewerlof does not anticipate claim 1, because Ewerlof does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Ewerlof does not teach that a metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. In contrast, Ewerlof teaches its apparatus is for use with intravenous injections and blood plasma. Ewerlof, col. 1, l. 23-26; col. 3, l. 5-12. That is, Ewerlof does not teach a metering device shall comprise a material reservoir containing a coating material. Hence, the reference does not teach that use with coating material. Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Ewerlof does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 6 and 22 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 6 and 22 are likewise in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and

therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 4-11-2006



Arlen Olsen  
Registration No. 37,543

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
22 Century Hill Drive, Suite 302  
Latham, New York 12110